

- (16) *Cladodactyla*. No case. The uncertainty may be set at rest some day, but anyhow there is no danger of confusion for the time being.
(17) and (18) *Thyonidium* and *Duasmodactyla*. A good case.
(19) *Dactylota*. No case.
(20) *Aspidochir*. A nomen dubium. No acute danger.
(21) *Liosoma*. A completely plain case of taxonomy, not of Nomenclature.
(22) *Oncinolabes*. As far as *mollis* is concerned, there might be a case here.
(23) *Tiedemannia*. A nomen dubium. No case.

As to the many specific names proposed for suppression, only

Holothuria glaberrima

Cladodactyla nigricans

Cuvieria Stichaensis

Holothuria Drummondi

and *Holothuria pellucida*

seem to constitute cases worthy of consideration.

May I suggest that the items contained in the numbers (generic part) 1), 2), 3), 5), 17 and 18), and 22) and (specific part) 1), 14), 22), 27), 31), 32), 33) be resubmitted individually for consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF *COLUBER*

CHIAMETLA SHAW, 1802. Z.N.(S.) 1704

(see volume 22, pages 235-236, volume 24, page 138)

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803, U.S.A.*)

The recommendation by Peters (1967, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 24 (3) : 138) that the petition for rejection of *Coluber chiametla* Shaw, 1802, suggests in general terms that the name *Drymobius margaritiferus* (Schlegel, 1837), which has been consistently used for this species for over a century, is not sufficiently widely used by non-herpetologists or even by herpetologists themselves to warrant use of the plenary powers of the Commission for its preservation. I wish merely to point out that I am aware of about 125 works, in the literature pertaining solely to Mexico and Guatemala. Since the species ranges from southern Texas to northern South America it is likely that at least twice as many references to the species occur in all literature as in the Mexican-Guatemalan component. These surely represent at least 200 different works. Some are popular, some strictly ecological, although most are taxonomic or distributional.

The species is perhaps the most common snake in lowland Mexico, is represented by large numbers in museums, is widely distributed, and is frequently exhibited in zoos. However as Peters points out it is not a species known in the non-herpetological literature except for a few ecological works.